



MOKSLAS • EKONOMIKA • SANGLAUDA



EUROPOS SĄJUNGA  
EUROPOS SOCIALINIS FONDAS

*Kuriame Lietuvos ateitį*



FINANSŲ MINISTERIJA



# CREATION OF INTERVENTION METHODS AND SOLUTIONS IN ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY AND EFFICIENCY OF PUBLIC SECTOR FIELDS OF ESF PROGRAMMES



International Evaluation Conference  
Cohesion Policy 2014–2020:  
Towards Evidence Based Programming and Evaluation

4–5 July 2013  
Vilnius, Lithuania

Antanas Sabanas

# Terms of reference

- Investigate the methods of intervention;
- Present practices of public authorities across the EU;
- Identify key difficulties faced by implementing, assessing projects;
- Experience from current and past programming periods;
- Comparative examples with other programmes;
- Recommendations for the next programming period.

# Background

- Enhancing institutional capacity & efficient public administration is one of the ‘thematic objectives’ (ESF Regulation for 2014-2020 proposal);
- The lack of administrative capacity was identified in CEEC as the main obstacle to implement the Acquis Communautaire and EU policies during the pre-accession period and afterwards - in the first round of Structural Funds implementation in the new Member States;
- Knowledge-based society and innovation-driven patterns of the most important factors for economical development (Lithuanian long-term development strategy of the state);
- Support has been limited to the Member States with less developed regions or eligible to the Cohesion Fund and it has been caused by objective factors:
  - Lack of trained public officials caused by different methods of administration before acceptance of the Acquis Communautaire and EU policies;
  - Former role of central and local authorities;
  - Lack of participation in decision making procedure of various stakeholders;
  - Former politicization of public administration.

# Principle of intervention

*“General knowledge of foreign administrative practices needs to be combined with a **deep understanding of the local constraints, opportunities, habits, norms, and conditions**”*

(Fukuyama, Francis. 2004. *State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press)

# Objectives of intervention (I)

- Aims of ESF programming and intervention (general):
  - ▣ Usage of public funds in the most efficient way;
  - ▣ Creation of qualitative public infrastructure;
  - ▣ Provision of qualitative public services;
  - ▣ Insurance of quality standards of public administration;
  - ▣ Promotion of innovation in the Member States or regions.

# Objectives of intervention (II)

- Specific aims of the thematic objective “Enhancing institutional capacity & efficient public administration”:
  - ▣ Implementation of reforms;
  - ▣ Ensuring better regulation and good governance;
  - ▣ Capacity building for stakeholders delivering employment, education and social policies;
  - ▣ Initiation of sectoral and territorial pacts to mobilise reform at national, regional and local level.

# Types of intervention (examples)

- Twinning projects;
- Trainings, seminars, coaching, preparation of study programmes;
- External advising, studies and statistics;
- IT solutions;
- Exchange of good practice examples.

# Obstacles for efficiency of intervention (I)

- ❑ Improper planning and maintaining of achieved results;
- ❑ Integration of instruments with results from projects financed by other programmes
- ❑ Irrelevance of project results to existing problems and challenges;
- ❑ Lack of qualified staff;
- ❑ Long and complex procedures and slow implementation.



# Obstacles for efficiency of intervention (II)

- ▣ Different standards (accountancy, file management, etc.);
- ▣ Local language of instruction, interface, system (e.g. not English, German, etc.);
- ▣ Limitation of transboundary projects to transboundary issues;
- ▣ Existing legal remedies and legal instruments (member states' peculiarities of the public procurement law, competition law);
- ▣ Different than planned outcome and results (existing financial mechanisms, programmes).

# Obstacles for efficiency of intervention

## (III)

- Even in international open procurement in fact mainly local service providers participate and submit tenders;
- The main information, especially technical specifications, has been provided in local language;
- High preparation costs for non-local firms (role of feasibility studies, programmes, plans of public institutions);
- Limitation for participation in programming level for local players.

# Obstacles for efficiency - ICT solutions

- Inter-operatibility with other systems: outside (other public institutions (central and local), banks, social security institutions) and inside (register of documents, accountancy, etc.);
- Confidential nature (technology, information dealt with the ICT systems);
- Complexity of the instrument (retraining, reorganization of institution);
- Maintenance of the outcome of the instruments (usage of IT systems should be well planned in terms of maintenance costs, linkages with other IT systems and possibilities of data exchange);
- Audit of IT systems:
  - Proper monitoring of ICT systems especially before implementation of projects.

# Suggestions (I)

- Increase role of the soft law (codes of goods conduct, service providers, model agreements);
- Publicity of common mistakes, good practices in project management;
- Pool of institutions for public procurement procedures (common procurement procedures);
- Pool of experts (rooster of experts);
- Proper legal remedies and procedures at courts:
  - ▣ Issue of freezing of assets.

# Suggestions (II)

- Integration of programmes:
  - ▣ Problem of double funding proof burden;
- Digitalization of application, assessment, reporting (adoption of electronic documents, non-duplication of paper version);
- Joint activities by various institutions, pool of sources (central, local authorities);
- Simplification of reporting and implementation of grant contract (digitalization procedure for the whole project implementation).

# Suggestions (III)

- Increase of transboundary competition in the public procurement procedure;
- Application of the same procedural rules (as for cohesion policies) for state, municipalities investment programmes;
- “Federalization” of public administration at the EU level inside the Member states institutions:
  - Capitalization of success stories by attracting public officials from other Member States;
- Application of common standards:
  - ISO, PRINCE 2, PMP.

# Suggestions (IV)

- ▣ Efficiency of anti-trust authorities;
- ▣ Orientation towards digital (e-governance) solutions;
- ▣ Distant working places, flexible labour force, especially for implementation of interventions;
- ▣ Integration of project management approach into public administrations (central, local authorities);
- ▣ Criteria for evaluation of tenders.

# Lithuanian perspective for the next programming period

16

- Achievement of better quality governance in the fields of (currently less than the average results in the comparison with other Member States):
  - Rule of law;
  - Voice and Accountability;
  - Government effectiveness;
  - Control of corruption.
- Capitalization of Lithuanian achievements regarding creation of e-solutions (e-government) which are above the EU average in these indicators:
  - Interaction with public authorities online;
  - Online access to 20 basic e-government services.